BX
4700
.T6
S251
1904

dup.

THOMAS AQUINAS AND LEO XIII

By David S. Schaff, D.D.
The Western Theological Seminary

From The Princeton Theological Review
April, 1904

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary
BX 4700
T6 S951
1904
Ram

THOMAS AQUINAS AND LEO XIII.

AS an ecclesiastical diplomat, Leo XIII will no doubt take high rank among the popes of modern times. He had no power to marshal armies and to set in motion crusades against refractory dissenters, as did Innocent III, nor did he exercise the function of fulmination against princes. And yet his moral influence throughout the bounds of all western Christendom has been notably great. He has elevated the papacy to a position of world-wide influence such as it has not had since the Reformation. Not before in their history have the different portions of Protestantism had so kindly a feeling toward a pope. For the moment room has been made even for a feeling of toleration for the papacy itself. Both feelings are due to the impression made by the virtues of Leo's private character. This impression was enhanced by the exceptional mental vigor Leo displayed into a high age and the youthful interest he manifested to the very end in current events, and which has seldom, if ever, been equaled in recent times. This personal sympathy of Protestants, strange to say, has been accorded to Leo in spite of his sweeping condemnations of Protestantism. His encyclicals* have denounced the Reformation, with its novel doctrines, as having produced "sudden tumults and most audacious revolts, especially in Germany." Its so-called philosophy is made the mother of unnumbered pests, such as communism, socialism and nihilism. The ultimate fruit of the Lutheran revolt is the ruin of morals.† In one of his very first encyclicals the evan-

* June 29, 1881; August 1, 1897, etc.

† *Ruinam morum ultimam maturavit, Encyclical,* August 1, 1897.

Reprinted from the April (1904) number of The Princeton Theological Review.

gelical schools of Rome were reprobated which had been "impudently planted under the very eyes of the pope, in which children of tender years are fed with abominable errors, and from which go forth influences most baneful and most injurious to morals." Such language might seem to be impolitic, and yet it remains true that the Protestant world was moved with genuine personal grief when Leo died.

In the histories of Christian doctrine Leo will take a different rank from that he is likely to hold in the records of papal diplomacy. It will be much inferior to that of his good-natured predecessor. Under Pius IX the dogma of the immaculate conception was announced and the dogma of papal infallibility was decreed by the vote of the famous Vatican Council, 1870. There are, however, at least two encyclicals issued by Leo which are ecclesiastical and theological in import, and have more than a passing interest. They show the intrepid courage and the originality of Leo's mind. The one promulgated September 13, 1896, declaring the orders of the Anglican Church invalid,* was calculated to strike a certain wing of English churchmen with dismay and at the same time to afford innocent amusement to most Protestants at the predicament in which they were placed. Protestants, who are not Episcopalians, read with intense interest the annals of the Anglican Reformation, but, with most of the eminent actors in that great religious movement, have cared very little whether or not a ministry can trace its pedigree of episcopal imposition of hands far into the precise past, so only it be of apostolic mind. In vain, it will be remembered, did Mr. Gladstone appeal to the pope to withhold his judgment. An honored bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church said to me the other day that Leo's decision did not change anything. No, certainly it did not. Historic fact remains fact. But the papal decision concerning, as it does, a general principle of Church polity, will probably be final for the Latin communion, and blasts the hope of union between Rome and Canterbury on the basis of orders presumed to be equally valid.

The other encyclical affecting theological principles singled out Thomas Aquinas as the authoritative teacher of faith and morals in these latter days. We should be inclined to pronounce Alphonso da Liguori the favorite theologian of Pius IX. In our estimation Leo made a far better choice. Thomas never went quite as far in the adulation of Mary as did Alphonso, and while he lacked the latter's pious verbiage he certainly was his equal in pious

* *Declaramus ordinationes ritu anglicana actas omnino nullas.*

fervor and his superior in judicious theological statement. Leo's encyclical *æterni patris*, issued August 4, 1879, pronounced Thomas by far the prince and master of all the scholastic doctors, as the safest guide of Christian philosophy in the battle of faith and reason against the skeptical and revolutionary tendencies of the nineteenth century. He is declared to have been keen in perception, tenacious in memory, most pure in life, a rare lover of truth and equipped beyond all in human knowledge, a man to be compared to the sun—he warmed the earth with the heat of his virtues, and filled it with the brightness of his doctrinal teaching. In his limpid and angelic mind the divine truth shines forth upon us, whether the wisdom be taken from the Scriptures or from tradition. As for his philosophy, every part of it was developed with skill and pushed to solid conclusions. And so well did Thomas treat the questions concerning God and created being, that nothing remains to be desired in the method, vigor and soundness of the argumentation, or in lucid perspicuity of statement. Thomas not only successfully warred against all the errors of former times, but supplied the invincible weapons against such errors as might arise later. He set to rest once for all the discord between faith and reason, exalting the dignity of each, and yet keeping them in friendly alliance. In this age, when the pursuit of physical science is held in such esteem, he is to be studied as a corrective and guide. For the enlightenment and restoration of all who have become alienated from the Catholic faith nothing could be more effective, if we except the divine aid, than the solid teachings of the Fathers and the Schoolmen. Nothing could be more timely for the welfare of both home and society than to present the teachings of the angelic doctor. Schools and colleges can do no better than to teach the doctrines as set forth in the volumes of Thomas. For the protection of the Catholic faith, for the good of society, for the increase of knowledge in all the sciences, all were exhorted to restore the "golden wisdom of Thomas and to propagate it far and near." The preface to the papal edition of the encyclical attacks the Lutheran pest and poison, *Lutheriana pestis, Lutherianum virus.**

In 1880 Leo again honored Thomas, by pronouncing him the patron of Catholic schools.

A comparison between the most eminent theologian of the thirteenth century and the most distinguished pontiff of the nine-

* I follow the text of the Roman edition. The more important parts are given by Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papstthums*. 2d edition, 1901, pp. 391–393

teenth century it is not the design to attempt. One might as well attempt to compare the Lombardy poplar and the apple tree. The two were most unlike. Leo was a prelate; Thomas was a theologian. Leo was a ruler; Thomas a student. Leo lived to be twice as old as Thomas. The pope was spare; the portrait of Thomas represents him as stout, full-fleshed. Leo wrote pious lyrics, Thomas wrote devotional hymns. The former had literary grace; the latter did not lack that quality, but he was pre-eminently a thinker, and a teacher of thinkers. But there can be no doubt that Leo's commendation of Thomas Aquinas commanded the attention of the theological world in a marked way, and stirred anew the interest of students in the writings of the greatest of the Schoolmen.

Leo placed another monument to Thomas' memory when he ordered the splendid edition of his works, called the Leonine edition, whose publication began in 1882, and for which the admiring pontiff set apart 300,000 lire. For English readers the life of Thomas is most satisfactorily related by Roger Vaughan, Catholic Archbishop of Sydney.*

Thomas Aquinas, called the angelic doctor, is the prince of the Schoolmen, and next to St. Augustine, the most eminent divine of the Latin Church.† He was a man of rare genius, wisdom and purity of life. He had an unrivaled power of orderly and vigorous statement. Under his masterly hand the scholastic doctrines were organized into a complete and final system. He expounded them with transparent clearness and fortified them with powerful arguments from Scripture, tradition and reason. He belongs to the second period of Scholasticism, its period of full bloom, and he was the most perfect master of the scholastic method. Anselm and Peter Abaelard were the brightest names of the first period.

Among Thomas' contemporaries were Albertus Magnus and Bonaventura; Duns Scotus was a little younger, as Alexander of Hales was older. Long before Leo ascended the papal throne, popes and councils repeatedly acknowledged Thomas' authority as a teacher of Catholic theology. He was canonized fifty years after his death by John XXIII, 1323, and raised to the dignity of a "doctor of the Church," 1567.

Thomas of Aquino, as he is usually styled by German and Italian writers, was born about 1225, near Aquino, in the territory of

* London, 1871, 1872, 2 vols. It is based largely upon the learned and exhaustive work of Werner, 3 vols., Regensburg, 1858, 1859.

† Gerson pronounced Bonaventura the most pious, consecrated and reliable of the mediæval doctors.

Naples, and died 1274, the same year as Bonaventura. Through his father, the Count of Aquino, he was descended from a princely house of Lombardy. His mother was of Norman blood and a descendant of the famous crusader, Tancred. At five the boy was sent to the neighboring convent of Monte Casino, from which he passed to the University of Naples. In 1243 he entered the Dominican Order, a step his family resented. His brothers, who were serving in the armies of Frederick II, took the novice by force and kept him under guard in the castle for more than a year. Especially strenuous was the opposition of his mother, whether from aversion to his devoting himself to the clerical life at all, or from chagrin that he had turned away from a possibly brilliant clerical career by throwing in his lot with the followers of Dominic, is not known. Thomas employed the time of his confinement in studying the Scriptures, the *Sentences* of the Lombard and the works of Aristotle. We next find him in Cologne under Albertus Magnus. That great Schoolman, recognizing the genius of his pupil, is reported to have said: "He will make such a noise in theology that he will be heard through all the earth."* He accompanied Albertus to Paris and returned to Cologne, 1248, as a teacher, and then went to Paris again and won the doctor's degree.

The Franciscan, Alexander of Hales, and other members of the mendicant orders, were winning their way to chairs in the university. William de St. Amour had made his vigorous assault upon the mendicant monks. Thomas wrote in their defense, as did also Bonaventura. Thomas was summoned to Anagni to present the case of the orders, and his address called forth the praise of Alexander IV. In a letter to the chancellor of the University of Paris, the pope spoke of Thomas as a man of noble birth, conspicuous by his virtues and by God's grace of encyclopædic learning. In 1261 Thomas left the teacher's chair in Paris and taught successively in Bologna, Rome and other Italian cities. Urban IV and Clement IV honored him with their confidence. The last two years of his life were spent in Naples. He died in the forty-ninth year of his age, on his way to the œcumenical council of Lyons. During the sessions of the council Bonaventura died and was buried with great pomp at Lyons. Dante, of course, combines these two contemporaries in his *Eulogy*. Stöckl calls them the "two brilliant luminaries on the horizon of the thirteenth century." Dante and Villani report

* To William of Thoco, who knew Thomas personally and wrote his biography: *ipse talem dabit in doctrina mugitum quod toto mundo sonabit.*

that Thomas was poisoned by order of that petty tyrant and maker of popes, Charles of Anjou. The earliest accounts know nothing of this. By the decision of Urban IV, the great teacher's body went to Toulouse, except the right arm, which was sent to the Dominican house of St. Jacques, Paris. At a later date the arm was removed to Rome.

In the number of his writings Thomas falls behind Albertus Magnus. But his industry was quite as wonderful when we recall that Albert lived to the high age of eighty-seven.* His philosophical works, like those of Albertus, were commentaries on Aristotle. He is reported to have had the *Stagyrite* translated into Latin by William of Moerbeke. His exegetical works include commentaries on Job, the first fifty-one Psalms, the Canticles, Isaiah, the Gospels, and other portions of Scripture. The exposition of the Gospels consists of excerpts from the Fathers, and is so contrived that it reads like a running commentary. The compiler introduced nothing of his own but connecting particles.† The apologetic works are of more importance. The chief among them are the work designed to convince the Mohammedans and other unbelievers‡ and the treatise designed to promote the union of the Greeks with the Western Church.

Most important of all Thomas' works were those in the departments of dogmatic theology and ethics. The earliest was a commentary on the *Sentences* of Peter the Lombard. To this class belong the expositions of the Apostolic Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Decalogue.

Thomas' first attempt at an independent systematic treatment of the entire realm of theology was his *Compendium theologiæ*. The subject was treated under the heads of the three cardinal virtues, faith, hope and charity. His master work, the *Summa theologica*, he did not live to finish, and the work is supplemented by compilations from the author's commentary on the Lombard.

Thomas Aquinas was above all a theologian. He was not a great monastic or ecclesiastical leader, like St. Bernard. What Beethoven is among modern musicians, Thomas is among the eminent theological intellects of mediæval times. With Augustine

* Sighart, in his *Leben Alberts des Grossen*, after giving a list of Albert's writings, pp. 288–301, pronounces Albert to be "probably the most fruitful of the world's authors."

† See Preface to the Oxford edition, p. iv. The work now known by the title *Aurea Catena* was called by Thomas in his letter dedicating it to Urban IV *Expositio continua*.

‡ *De veritate catholicæ fidei contra Gentiles*. The first three books include the arguments from reason, the fourth the argument from revelation.

and John Calvin he shares the distinction of being one of the three master theological thinkers of the Western world. Augustine belongs to the whole Western Church, and has been the most influential of Christian theologians. Thomas gave fixed form to the theology of Roman Catholicism. Calvin became the teacher of Protestantism. What John of Damascus did for the theology of the Greek Church, Thomas did for the theology of the mediæval Latin Church. He gave to it its most perfect form. He was not so profound as Anselm, nor so learned as Albertus Magnus, nor so subtle as Duns Scotus, nor quite so mystical in his piety as his Franciscan contemporary, Bonaventura. His commanding eminence rests upon his clearness of method and his well-balanced judgment, rather than upon originality of thought. Eucken says properly: "He does not belong so much to the creative as to the systematizing minds."* Following such eminent dogmaticians as Peter the Lombard, Hugo de St. Victor and Alexander of Hales, he excelled them all in method and clearness of statement, unless it be the Lombard. He was not a great scholar, and, like St. Augustine, knew no Hebrew and little Greek. Abaelard, Albertus Magnus and Bonaventura seem to show a wider familiarity than he with the ancient authors, patristic and profane. He abounds in Scripture quotations, and whoever has made the mistake of thinking that mediæval writers were not familiar with the Scriptures will at once find out his error by turning over a few pages of Thomas' *Theology*. Among human authorities Thomas, like the other Schoolmen, had as his chief authorities Augustine and Aristotle. These were like two lighthouses, by which he guided the heavy galleon of his theologic thought. Aristotle he refers to continually as "the Philosopher." He leaned much upon Albertus Magnus, the most widely read and learned man of the thirteenth century and the chief German scholar and theologian of the Middle Ages. Leo XIII, in an epistle allowing Borgnet to dedicate his edition of Albert's works† to him, associates the two Schoolmen, and says: "Especially am I glad to grant this permission, because our old love for the angelic doctor is not disjoined from love for his teacher." Both traverse the whole area of spiritual and cosmic problems, with this difference, that Albert has an eye more for the works of nature, Thomas for moral action. Stöckl goes too far when he

* *Die Philosophie des Thomas von Aquino*, p. 4. Eucken repeats this judgment in his *Thomas von Aquino und Kant*, p. 27.

† Borgnet's ed. in thirty-six volumes was published in Paris, 1890 *sqq.* Labbé, the Jesuit editor of the acts of the Councils, wrote a poem comparing Thomas and Albert, which is found in Borgnet, Vol. I, p. lxxii *sq.*

says that "Thomas stands wholly upon Albert's shoulders. He finished what Albert began."* Thomas received a strong impulse from Albert's fresh mind, but especially in the departments of ethics and apologetics he went out into regions not fully explored by his teacher. The Schoolmen had no hesitancy about using each other's material, and even incorporating each other's statements.† Thomas, however, dissents even from the Lombard in not a few places.

The *Summa theologica* goes beyond the understanding of beginners, for whom it was written, but, true to its author's promise, avoids many of the idle discussions of his immediate predecessors and contemporaries.‡ The treasures of the school and the Church are here gathered together, sifted and compacted into a structure which rises in simple and impressive grandeur, as the mediæval cathedrals did above the buildings around them. The three books into which it is divided treat of God, man and the Redeemer. The sacraments are included under the last head. The matter is disposed of in 518 divisions called *questiones*, and these are divided into 2652 *articula*. Each article states the negative and positive sides of the proposition under discussion, the arguments for and against the proposition, and then the author's solution. This same uniform threefold method of treatment is pursued throughout. While it has decided advantages, it would become insufferably monotonous but for the precision of statement, the author's evidently lofty purpose and the interest of the materials. Each question, and even each article, is a finished piece of literary work. Here is an example:

The topic under discussion is the simplicity of God. § In article one of the third question, the proposition is propounded whether God is body, *utrum Deus sit corpus*. In favor of an affirmative reply is: 1. The consideration that God seems to have a body, for a body has three dimensions, and the Scriptures ascribe to God heighth, depth and length (Job xi. 8). 2. Whatsoever has a figure has a body. God seems to have a figure (Gen. i. 26), for He says, "Let us make man in our image." 3. Everything that has parts has a body. A hand (Job xl. 4) and eyes (Ps. xxxiv. 15) are ascribed to God. 4. God has a seat and a throne (Isa. vi. 1). 5. God has a local termination to which men may approach (Ps.

* *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, II, 421. Sighart takes the view of Stöckl.

† Baltzer, in his *Die Sentenzen des Petrus Lombardus*, 1902, shows this plainly.

‡ *Multiplicatis inutilium quæstionum, articulorum et argumentorum*, Prologue.

§ *De Dei simplicitate*, I, q. 3. Migne's ed., I, 626 *sqq*.

xxxiv. 5). On the other hand must be noted what is said (John iv. 24), "God is spirit." The absolute God, therefore, is not body. 1. No body moves that is not before moved, and God is the first mover. 2. God is the first entity, *primum ens*. 3. God is the noblest among entities. The answer to the objections are: 1. The Scripture passages ascribing to God bodily parts are figurative. 2. The expression "image of God" is used solely to indicate God's superior excellency over man and man's superiority over the beasts. 3. The ascription of corporal senses, such as the eye, is a way of expressing God's intelligence.

Theological speculation with Thomas is not intellectual acrobatism. It is a genuinely pious employment pursued with the end of knowing and worshiping God. On his way to Paris he is reported to have exclaimed that he would not give Chrysostom on Matthew for all the city. It is also related of him that during the last years of his life in Naples the Lord appearing to him, asked him what reward he desired, for he had written well on theological questions. Thomas replied, "None other, Lord, but thyself." Whether legendary or not, these sayings indicate the deep religious nature of the angelic doctor.

A large element of mysticism was mingled with scholasticism. This was the case with Anselm and with Bonaventura, as it was with their great forerunner Augustine. The Schoolmen were conscious of the inexhaustible depth of divine truth which the power of logic cannot reach. With the temper of speculation they combined the habit of spiritual meditation and prayer. They did not intend to string together rabbinical casuistries embodying in cold dogmatic formulas shrewd and refined metaphysical abstractions. They were moved with a profound sense of the presence of God and the sacrifice made on the cross. It would be hard to read Thomas Aquinas without feeling the glow of religious fervor. In his writings you feel the throb of the dialectic machinery, but you also feel the warmth of religious sympathy. One of the merits of Thomas is that he made a clearer distinction between philosophy and religion, reason and revelation than had been made before by the Schoolmen. He makes the assertion very positively that the higher truths pertaining to God, such as the doctrine of the Trinity, the reason is not competent by its own powers to discover.* And divine truths which the natural reason is capable of reaching with-

* *Impossibile est per rationem naturalem ad cognitionem trinitatis personarum pervenire* (Migne's ed., I, 607, 888). He also declares that it cannot be demonstrated by pure reason that the world had a beginning (Migne's ed., I, 1098).

out aid, are apt to be mixed with error in our conception, so that here also revelation is necessary to rid the judgment of erroneous opinions. Moreover, few have the talent to reach them by pure reason. The ideas which the natural mind can reach with certainty are the *præambula fidei.* They pertain to the vestibule of faith. Reason has its rights and Thomas guards them. Theology uses the human reason, not, it is true, to prove faith, for such a process would take away the merit of faith, but to throw light on doctrines which are furnished by revelation and theology.*

Philosophy is the handmaid of theology, *ancilla.* Theology is the higher science, both because of the certainty of its data, which are gotten through revelation, and on account of the superior excellence of its subject matter. Both are fountains of knowledge. There is no contradiction between philosophy and theology. Both come from God. It is not the concern of the Schoolmen to seek for new spiritual truth in the Scripture. That they took for granted as having been sufficiently done by the Fathers. The Church preserved the dogmatic body of truth. The task the Schoolmen undertook was to confirm what they had inherited. For this reason they made no original contributions to exegesis and Biblical theology. They discovered no new dogmas. They did not propose to themsevles to be independent investigators in the domain of dogma. Under the yoke of authority they were, and yet they wrought out systems of great speculative ingenuity and argumentative strength. They wrought a great work for their own times. We of these modern days may well be thankful to them for the honor they placed upon the human understanding in attempting to exhaust every question of heaven and earth and work out with patience their systems.

As between the Scriptures and the Fathers, Thomas also makes a clear distinction. The Church uses both to arrive at and expound the truth. The Scriptures are necessary and final. The testimony of the Fathers is probable.† The theology of the Church is authoritive, and Thomas' controlling purpose is to properly present it as he found it.‡ Nevertheless, by clearly placing the Scriptures above the Fathers he makes an advance upon other School-

* *Summa,* I, 1, 8; Migne's ed., I, 615.

† *Sacra scientia auctoritatibus canonicæ Scripturæ utitur proprie et ex necessitate argumentando; auctoritatibus autem aliorum doctorum ecclesiæ quasi arguendo ex propriis sed probabiliter* (*Summa,* I, 1, 8; Migne, I, 615. Also *Summa,* II, [2]; I, 10; Migne, III, 26).

‡ Baur, *Geschichte des Mittelalters,* p. 354, says: "Seine Darstellung will garnichts anders sein als das wissenschaftliche Bewusstsein der kirchlichen Lehre."

men. In his use of Scripture he does not rely upon the allegorical interpretation to the extent that other Schoolmen did.

Philosophy and theology pursue different methods in searching after truth. Philosophy contemplates the visible creation and rises through it to the knowledge of God.* In discussing the knowledge of Adam before the Fall, he says, Adam did not reach God by demonstration, from the effects of his workmanship as the natural man now must do.† Theology, or the doctrine of faith, contemplates God as He is in Himself, and from Him goes out to the objects of the natural universe. In the case of philosophy, knowledge precedes faith. With theology, faith precedes knowledge.‡

Some of the statements associated with Thomas' name as characteristically or authoritatively stated may be adduced. The existence of God is not exclusively a matter of faith. The proofs set up by philosophers are irrefragible. The statement that God exists does not establish His real being. The ontological argument, elaborated by Anselm, Thomas sets aside. He affirms that a conception in the mind, *esse in intellectu*, is something different from actual existence, *esse in re*. He adduces four cosmological arguments, and the argument from design. They are these: 1. Motion presupposes an original mover. 2. An infinite series of causes it is impossible to conceive. Therefore there must be a first cause. 3. The conditioned demands that which is absolute. 4. That which is imperfect necessitates that which is perfect, as a standard of judgment. 5. The indications of adaptation in the universe point to an intelligent ruler. Objects seem to be controlled by an overruling design, as an arrow shot by an archer. §

Creation was not a necessity for God on account of any deficiency within Himself. It was the expression of His goodness and love. ‖ Revelation teaches that the world was created out of nothing. But with Aristotle, Thomas agreed in denying that, by the natural reason, the world can be proved to have had a beginning. ¶

The garden of Eden was a real place. Geographies, however, do not locate it. It is secluded by barriers of mountains, seas and

* *Per creaturam Dei cognitionem pervenimus* (*Summa*, I, 88, 3; Migne, I, 1350).

† Migne, I, 1398.

‡ This reminds us of Anselm's maxim: "I believe that I may understand" —*credo ut intelligam, non intelligo ut credam.*

§ *Sicut sagitta a saggitante* (*Summa*, I, 2, 3; Migne, I, 622 *sqq*). Köstlin gave a clear statement of Thomas' arguments in his "Beweise fürs Dasein Gottes," *Studien und Kritiken*, 1876, p. 10 *sqq*.

‖ *Propter amorem suæ bonitatis.*

¶ In this Thomas differs from Albertus Magnus. Albert declared that Aristotle had erred in declaring the world to be eternal.

a certain tempestuous region.* It is doubtful whether modern study and exploration have discovered anything that would have led Thomas to fix upon any locality. It is a sign of Adam's immortality that he was created outside of Paradise, and then put into it.

In discussing the origin of evil, Thomas starts out by recalling that God is incomprehensible. In a perfect world there will be all possible grades of being. The weal of the whole is more important than the well-being of any part. By the permission of evil the good of the whole is advanced. Evil is a defect of the good. Many good things would be wanting but for evil. As life is advanced by corruption in the natural world, so, to take a single instance, patience is developed by persecution.

The dignity of the human will is shown in this, that it is not subject to compulsion. The natural order cannot bind God. His will is free and may express itself in supernatural ways. He does not work contrary to the natural order but outside of it, *præter ordinem.*† Children sometimes have six fingers. The Providence of God includes what to us seems to be accidental. A man digging finds a treasure. To him the discovery is an accident. But the master, who set him to work at a certain place, had it in mind. From the divine providence as the basal principle the decree of predestination is elaborated.

As God's simple nature can only be expressed by differentiation and variation in creation, so God has ordained that in the realm of grace there should be grades of being. The elect are substituted for the angels who kept not their first estate, even as the Gentiles were substituted for the Jews.‡ The number of the elect is unknown, but they are a minority of the race. Their number and the number of the reprobate are fixed. Reprobation is not a positive act of God. God's decree is permissive. God loves all men. He leaves men to themselves, and those who are lost are lost by their own guilt. God's decree of election includes the purpose to confer grace and glory. "The mercy of God finds its highest manifestation in the salvation of some, which salvation the most lack in accordance with the course and inclination of nature."

In his treatment of angelology, Thomas practices a commendable self-restraint as compared with Bonaventura and other Summists. Nor does he follow Albertus Magnus in all his curious questions

* *Ideo scriptores locorum de hoc loco mentionem non fecerunt* (*Summa*, I, 102 1; Migne, I, 1433).

† *Summa*, I, 108, 7; Migne, I, 1446.

‡ *Summa*, I, 26, 6; Migne, I, 828.

about Lucifer and the wicked angels, their realm, their stature, their activities, their states of mind.

In his treatment of man Thomas is relatively most full. In the discussion of man's condition before the Fall and his state in consequence of it, many questions are proposed adapted to call forth all possible dialectical dexterity where Scriptural information is lacking. Here are examples: Could Adam in his state of innocence see the angels? Did he have knowledge of all things? Did he need food? Were the children born in the state of innocence confirmed in righteousness? Would original sin have passed down upon Adam's posterity if Adam had refused to join Eve in sinning? In answer to the last question Thomas replies that if Adam had not joined Eve in sinning, original sin would not have passed down to his posterity, for, according to the Fathers, the active agent in generation is the father. But if Adam had sinned and Eve had not sinned, original sin would have passed down to Adam's descendants.*

Animals have souls, but the soul being indissolubly attached to the body, animals are not immortal. Thomas denies the preexistence of the soul, and pronounces the traducian theory of its origin by procreation a heresy.† Following the Lombard, he taught that grace was a superadded gift to Adam over and above the natural qualities of the soul and body.‡ That gift disposed man to love God above all things.

But for the Fall original righteousness would have passed down upon Adam's posterity. The cause of sin was the inordinate love of self. Original sin is a disorder of the moral constitution, and shows itself in concupiscence, irrational desire. It is a corrupt condition of the soul, as sickness is a corrupt condition of the body. The corruption of nature, however, is partial—a wound, not a total deadness. This un-Calvinistic view is the view of the Catholic Church.

The subject of Christ and redemption Thomas approaches by saying that "our Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, has shown us the way of truth in Himself, the way by which we are to attain through resurrection to the beatitude of immortal life." It is taken up under three main heads—the person of the Saviour, the sacraments, which are the channels of salvation, and the goal or immortal life. The Anselmic view of the atonement is followed. The infinitude

* *Summa*, I, 2, 75, 5; Migne, II, 633 *sqq.*

† *Hæreticum est dicere quod anima intellectiva traducatur cum semine* (*Summa*, I, 118, 2; Migne, I, 1556).

‡ *Summa*, I, 95, 1. Comp. Loofs, *Dogmengeschichte*, pp. 292–295.

of human guilt made it fitting that the Son of God should make atonement. God, however, was not shut up to this method. He can forgive sins as He pleases. The satisfaction of Christ is not only sufficient; it is superabundant. Thomas distinguishes between justification and sanctification, and declares justification to have been a single instantaneous act.* It is not a progressive process, as the Catholic Church is generally supposed to teach. Faith working by love lays hold of this grace. Justification Thomas defines as "an infusion of grace whereby the free will is moved and guilt is pardoned." It is not a declarative act, as the Reformers taught.

Thomas' teaching concerning the future was followed by Dante, and continues to be the written theology of the Catholic Church. The inferno consists of three places: one where the holy patriarchs, *sancti patres*, are (that is, the righteous partakers of the first covenant), the place of those who need purging, and the place of the lost. Christ descended into Hades and made an impression through the whole infernal world, striking the lost with terror, awakening hope in those who are waiting to be purified, and liberating the righteous of the old covenant. The last class were liberated at once by the breaking of the bars of hell and were admitted to the beatific vision.† The death of Christ delivered them from the guilt of all sin, original and actual. They had had the joy of hope for Abraham rejoiced to see Christ's day; circumcision, under the old law, remitted original sin, and in so far took the place of baptism.

As for unbaptized children dying in infancy, there is no release for them. They are detained in hell for the sin of Adam, and are in no wise bound to Christ in His passion and death by the exercise of faith and love, as the patriarchs of the Old Testament were. They could not have exercised faith, for infants have no use of their wills; nor was the sacrament of faith, baptism, applied to them. Christ's descent in Hades could not accomplish redemption. Redemption was accomplished on the cross. Infants are liberated from original sin in baptism, and without baptism no one can be saved.

Aquinas' view of the eternal destiny of unbaptized infants‡ was inherited from Augustine. That theologian held that eternal death was their lot, but that their damnation was the lightest of

* *Justificatio impii non est successiva* (*Summa*, I, 2, 113, 7 *sqq.*; Migne, II, 955).

† *Deum per essentiam videre in quo consistit perfecta hominis beatitudo* (*Summa*, III, 52, 5; Migne, IV, 482).

‡ *Summa*, III, 57, 7; Migne, IV, 485 *sqq.* Thomas does not dwell upon the subject at length.

all, *omnium levissima.* Anselm adopted this view and Robert Pullen. Peter the Lombard made a distinction between the punishment which consisted in the lack of the beatific vision and the punishment of the flesh. Bonaventura and Albertus Magnus adopted the distinction.* Thomas rejected it on the ground that the pain was thereby not lessened, for spiritual woe is always greater than physical distress, and also on the ground that it was far better to suffer in a conscious state of mind than to be out of one's mind and to rejoice, *gaudere insanus.*

The fire of hell is physical. The blessed will be able to contemplate the woes of the lost without sorrow, and are led, as also Albertus had said, by the sight of their woes to praise God supremely for their own redemption. Their beatitude is not increased by this vision, a doctrine, our own Dr. Samuel Hopkins, five hundred years later, developed at length. The body of the resurrection will be the same even to the bowels.†

The doctrine of the sacraments as expounded by Thomas is in all particulars the doctrine of the Catholic Church. Christ won grace. The Church imparts it. The sacraments are defined as Augustine and Abaelard defined them, visible signs of invisible things. Their number is seven, corresponding to the seven cardinal virtues and the seven mortal sins. All were instituted by Christ. The Apostles anointed the sick with oil. This custom, argues Thomas, must have been in accordance with an injunction previously given by Christ.‡ They are efficacious remedies for sin and make for the perfecting of man in righteousness. The virtue lies in the sacrament itself, and is not conditioned by faith in the recipient. Three of the sacraments, baptism, confirmation and ordination, have an indelible character. Every conceivable question pertaining to the sacraments is taken up by Thomas and solved. His treatment of the eucharist and baptism occupies no less than two hundred and fifty pages of Migne's edition. §

Baptism, the original form of which was immersion, cleanses from original sin and incorporates with the body of Christ. Children of Jews and infidels are not to be baptized without the consent of their parents.‖ In case of necessity women may baptize.¶ Thomas justifies the administration of the rite by women on the ground that

* See Werner, *Leben d. Thomas von Aquino*, I, 844.
† *Summa*, III, 94; Migne, IV, 1343 *sqq.*
‡ *Summa*, III, 64, 2.
§ IV, 600–852.
‖ *Summa*, II (2), 10, 12; Migne, III, 101 *sqq.*
¶ *Summa*, III, 68, 4; Migne, IV, 627.

in Christ there is neither male nor female. The male layman may, in case of necessity, baptize. So also the female laic. According to John i. 33, it is Christ chiefly who baptizes. Thomas rejects uterine baptism on the ground that to the infant yet unborn the baptismal water cannot be applied.

In the elements of the Lord's Supper the glorified body of the Redeemer is wholly present, and present essentially, not quantitatively.* The words "This is my body" are susceptible of only one interpretation. The dimensions of the bread and all its "accidents," such as whiteness, remain. The substance of the bread alone undergoes change, and the whole body of Christ is in every part of the bread.† The whole body of Christ is present in the wine as well as the bread.‡ But it is not visible, lest the unbeliever should accuse the faithful of being flesh-eaters, and also for the reason that the merit of faith may be emphasized by its exercise in that which is unseen.

As for penance, it is efficacious to the removal of guilt incurred subsequent to baptism. It includes, as the Lombard had before stated, contrition, confession and satisfaction. Indulgences have efficacy for the dead as well as the living. Their dispensation belongs primarily to the pope, as the head of the Church. The fund of merit, upon which the Church draws in the bestowal of indulgences, is the product chiefly of the superabounding merit of Christ, but also of the supererogatory works of the saints. Extreme unction includes the remission of sins and restoration to spiritual health. The sacrament of ordination is indispensable to the existence of the Church.

In his treatment of ethics, Thomas Aquinas rises far above the other mediæval writers. The opinion which regards the Schoolmen as divorcing doctrines from conduct certainly finds its refutation in the angelic doctor, to speak of no other mediæval theologian. His entire treatment of theology has a practical purport. One-third of his system, or nearly two hundred questions, is distinctly devoted to matters of Christan practice. Here his references to "the Philosopher" are very frequent. § His grasp of the subject and his extensive elaboration mark an epoch in the science. Neander pronounced him the leading moralist since the days of Aris-

* *Per modum substantiæ non quantitatis* (*Summa*, III, 76, 4; Migne, IV, 788).

† Migne, IV, 737.

‡ *Totus Christus sub utraque specie* (*Summa*, III, 76, 2; Migne, IV, 734).

§ Baur pronounces Thomas' method descriptive rather than consequential —that is, developed from a body of basal principles (*Gesch. d. Mittelalters*, p. 429 *sqq.*).

totle. He enters into details in analyzing the conduct of daily life. To adduce a single example, he discusses the question of drunkenness and, with Aristotle, decides that drunkenness is no excuse for crime.* But Thomas, in this department also, in the attempt to be exhaustive, allows himself to be led into useless questions where sophistry has free play. Such questions as these are soberly discussed: whether a "man should love his child more than his father," or "his mother more than his father."

Thomas opens his ethical treatment with a discussion of the highest good, that is blessedness, which does not consist in riches, honor, power or pleasure. Riches minister only to the body, and the more we have of them, the more are they despised on account of their insufficiency to meet human needs, as our Lord said of the waters of the world, that whosoever drinks of them shall thirst again. Blessedness consists in nothing else than the vision of God as He is in Himself.† Delight is a necessary concomitant of blessedness, as warmth is of fire.

Actions are such as differentiate man from the beast, and such as grow out of the passions which man has in common with the beast. The virtues are the three religious virtues infused by God—faith, hope and love—and the four philosophical or cardinal virtues—prudence, righteousness, endurance and continence. They are treated at great length. No less than forty-six questions are devoted to the religious virtues. The essence of Christian perfection is love.‡

In his theory of Church and State, Thomas was completely a child of his age. § He gave fixed form to the theological statement of the supremacy of the spiritual estate, the primacy of the pope and the right of the Church to punish heretics with death. His views on these important questions are laid down in his *Summa* and in three other writings on the *Rule of Princes*, the *Errors of the Greeks* and *Against the Greeks*. Thomas contends that the State exists to secure for man the highest end of his being, namely, the salvation of his soul, as well as for his material well-being in this life. He shows no concern for the separate European States and nationalities. ‖ As the head of the mystical body of Christ, the

* *Summa*, II (2), 150, 4; Migne, III, 1051.

† *In visione divinæ essentiæ* (Migne, II, 43).

‡ *Per se et essentialiter consistit perfectio christianæ vitæ in charitate* (*Summa*, II (2), 84, 3; Migne, III, 1295).

§ See Werner, *D. heilige Thomas*, I, 760 *sqq.*, 794 *sqq.*; Köstlin, art. "Staat und Kirche," *Herzog. Encycl.*, 2d ed., XIV, 629 *sqq.*, and especially Reusch, *Die Fälschungen in dem Traktat des Th. von Aquino gegen die Griechen*, Munich, 1889.

‖ Eucken, *D. Phil. des Thomas*, p. 38.

pope is supreme over the civil estate, even as the spiritual nature is superior to man's physical nature. Thus theological affirmation is given to the theories of Hildebrand and Innocent III. Christian kings owe the pope subjection, as they owe subjection to Christ Himself, for the pope is Peter's successor and the vicar of Christ.* The *monarchia Christi* has taken the place of the *imperium Romanum.*

As for the Church, Rome is the mother and mistress of all Churches. Obedience is due to her as it is to Christ.† The work *Against the Greeks,* which contains this statement, discusses four points: the procession of the Holy Ghost, the primacy of the pope, the use of unleavened bread in the eucharist, and purgatory. The second Council of Lyons was impending, at which the union with the Greeks was a more prominent subject of negotiation than it had been for several hundred years before, and was destined to be since, except at the Council of Basel-Ferrara, in the first half of the fifteenth century. The Dominicans were particularly active in urging the extravagant claims of the papacy as against the Greek patriarch. The unity of the Church, Thomas argued, demands and presupposes a supreme centre of authority. Every individual Church of Christendom is ruled from this centre. The pope determines what is of faith. Subjection to him is a condition of salvation.‡ High Churchmanship could no further go.

In his declaration on the subject of heresy and its treatment, Thomas materially assisted in making the persecution of heretics unto death the accredited policy of the Church and the State. At any rate, he cleared away all objections to such persecution as far as it was possible to clear them away. Heresy, he taught, is a crime to be punished like coin clipping. No one can be compelled to enter the Church, but once having entered it, persons were to be compelled to hold to the faith. Measures of violence were to be

* *Successor Petri, Christi vicarius Romanus Pontifex cui omnes reges populi Christiani oportet esse subdito sicut ipse domino Jesu Christo, de reg. principum* I, 14. Two of the four books of this famous treatise are certainly genuine. Poole, in his *Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought,* pp. 240–246, has some judicious remarks on the *Rule of Princes.*

† *Romanæ ecclesiæ magistræ et matris omnium ecclesiarum cui obediendum est anquam Domino Jesu Christo. Contra errores Græcorum* (Reusch's ed., p. 9. Also Mirbt, *Quellen,* p. 143).

‡ *Subesse Romano pontifici est de necessitate salutis.* Boniface VIII gave expression to the same doctrine in his famous bull, *Unam sanctam* (1302) *subesse Romano pontifici omni humanæ creaturæ declaramus omnino esse de necessitate salutis.* This was a vast leap beyond Cyprian's famous statement that "outside the Church there is no salvation"—*extra ecclesiam nulla salus.*

used, if necessary.* Heretics deserve not alone excommunication from the Church, but also exclusion from the world by death.†

Thomas Aquinas was elevated by the Dominican Order to the dignity of an authoritative teacher a few years after his death, 1286. His scholars were numerous, but his theology met with opposition at Paris and Oxford, and was condemned. It is most interesting to know that Albertus Magnus went to Paris to defend his brilliant pupil. After the death of Duns Scotus, the Franciscan, the differences between the two teachers were emphasized and involved the two orders in controversy for centuries. No less than eighty-two supposed or real differences between them were noted down.‡

The Thomists lost by the decree of the immaculate conception of Mary, promulgated in 1854, the doctrine which had been the chief bone of contention with the Franciscans. Leo XIII, by making Thomas' theology and philosophy a standard for Catholic teaching, has repaired any loss Thomas' reputation may have previously sustained through the decree of Pius IX. Leo also appeased any remaining feeling the Dominicans may have had over the issue of their contention and the triumph of the Franciscans by settling the controversy over the origin of the rosary, which the Carmelites also lay claim to, in favor of "the great Dominic who introduced the use of the rosary of Mary as a balm for the wounds of his contemporaries." §

The Reformers were severe upon the angelic doctor as the chief theological representative of the ecclesiastical dogmatism of the Middle Age. On one occasion Luther compared him to the star of Revelation which fell from heaven, the empty speculations of Aristotle to the smoke from the bottomless pit, and Aristotle himself to his master Apollyon. ‖ The Reformer went so far as to call Thomas' *Summa* the quintessence of all heresies, meaning thereby the papal doctrines. And in another place he bitterly condemned

* *Hæretici sunt compellendi ut fidem teneant.*

† Summa, II (ii), 9, 11; Migne, iii, 109. Thomas' theory was that baptism gave to the Church right over the life and death of those who received the rite Augustus Triumphus (d. 1328) extended this right so as to include the heathen.

‡ Werner devotes a whole volume of 876 pages of his *Life of Thomas* to the posthumous influence of his hero. It takes up the teaching of his pupils, the conflicts of the Dominican Order with the Franciscans, Jesuits, etc., and brings in the names of Des Cartes, Leibnitz, Malebranche, etc.

§ Encylical of September 1, 1883. Thomas expressly denied the immaculate conception in the sense that Mary was conceived without parental concupiscence. Augustine had suggested this doctrine of her sinlessness when he said, "Concerning her I wish to raise no question in regard to sin out of honor to the Lord" (*de Nat. et gratia*).

‖ Köstlin, *D. Leben M. Luthers*, I, 431.

"the cursed heathen Aristotle." "You are much to be condemned," said Luther to Prierias, "for daring to obtrude upon us as articles of faith, opinions of that sainted man Thomas and his frequent false conclusions."

Such polemic judgments have long since yielded to a more calm and just historical estimate of that truly extraordinary man, Thomas Aquinas. The Reformers in their indignation against the scholastic theology could not do justice to him. If we differ from him in many particulars, we will not be blind to his great merits, his candor and strength as a systematic theologian, his sincerity of purpose as an ethical thinker and the purity of his personal character. He did not go beyond the ecclesiastical institution of his age. He represents the extreme theory of Church authority as opposed to the liberty of the individual.* He stands for those doctrines which differentiate the traditional and official Roman Catholic teaching from the Scriptural teaching of Protestantism. He advocated the supremacy of the bishop of Rome over all bishops and his superior authority in the entire Church of Christ, and defined the Church so as to exclude all who do not accept the papal primacy and sacramental system of the mediæval Church.

Leo XIII, in pronouncing Thomas the authoritative expounder of Christian theology, chose out the most clear and exhaustive theological defender of the peculiar doctrines of the Roman Catholic system. From the standpoint of an unalterable Catholic orthodoxy, he made no mistake. Protestants differ from him in the expectation that the schoolman's argumentation will settle the theological and religious unrest of the day which grows out of our new Biblical theories, our scientific discoveries and the modern world in which we live. The artillery used on the battlefields of Jena and Waterloo do not meet the demands of modern warfare. Even less can we accept Thomas' fundamental principle of the final authority of the external organism of the Church. The rights of the individual are being asserted more and more, and, as there are some reasons to suppose, even within the pale of the Roman communion of which Leo was the distinguished head. In the broader communion of the entire Church, we are glad to think Leo occupies a place even as Thomas Aquinas occupies a high place in the galaxy of the eminent theological thinkers of all the Christian centuries.

The Western Theological Seminary. DAVID S. SCHAFF.

* Eucken presents Thomas and Kant as representatives of two antagonistic principles, the mediæval and the modern, the authority of the Church and the authority of individual reason.

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BX4700.T6 S251 1904
Schaff, David Thomas Aquinas and Leo XII
3 0645 0009 2136 7